



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,635	08/31/2001	Peiguang Zhou	KCC-16,631	9238
7590 10/22/2003			EXAMINER	
Pauley Petersen Kinne & Fejer Suite 365 2800 W. Higgins Road Hoffman Estates, IL 60195			SALVATORE, LYNDIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/944,635	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZHOU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lynda M Salvatore	<b>Art Unit</b> 1771	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-30,33-57 and 60-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-30,33-57 and 60-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
Translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's response dated June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003 has been entered. No claims have been amended and claims 1-10,13-30,33-57 and 60-67 are currently pending. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered, however, they are not found persuasive of patentability for reasons set forth herein below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-16, 20-24, 28-36, 42-51, 55-62,64,66, 67 and 68-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zafiroglu, US 5,468,320 in view of Hall, Jr., et al., US 3,370,106 as set forth in section 3 of the last Office Action.

Applicant argues a lack of motivation to combine the references of Zafiroglu and Hall, Jr., et al., asserting that <sup>the</sup> general disclosure of gluing taught by Zafiroglu would not motivate some of ordinary skill in the art to look to Hall, Jr., et al., for a suitable adhesive composition. Applicant argues that Hall, Jr., et al., teaches using the hot melt adhesive composition with Kraft paper not a non-woven fabric (Applicant's response, page 3). These arguments are not found persuasive on the grounds that as set forth in the Examiners previous Office Action, Hall, Jr., et al., teaches that the hot melt adhesive comprising isotactic and atactic polypropylene is suitable to bond wood, paper, and textiles (Column 1, lines, 35-36). Recall, textile is freely defined in the art as any product made from fibers; thus, the term refers not only to woven fabrics, but also to non-woven fabrics, knitted fabrics and special fabric construction (*Introductory Textile Science*,

Marjory L. Joseph, Copyright- 1986, Page 1). As such, the Examiner maintains that there is sufficient motivation to combine Zafiroglu with Hall, Jr., et al., to form the 103(a) obviousness rejection set forth above. With regard to the Applicant's discussion on the similarities between the Zafiroglu and Wang, and the arguments that follow, it is the position of the Examiner that these arguments are moot in light of the fact that Wang was not relied upon for this rejection (Applicant's response, spanning pages 4-7). Though, Zafiroglu does not teach a specific adhesive, the general teaching of gluing provides enough motivation to look to the art for suitable adhesive products, particularly the hot melt adhesive taught by Hall, Jr., et al., regardless if Wang teaches away from such an adhesive composition.

4. Claims 17-19, 37-41, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zafiroglu, US 5,468,320 in view of Hall, Jr., et al., US 3,370,106 as applied to claims 1, 21 and 48 above and further in view of Meece et al., US 2002/0039637 as set forth in section 4 of the last Office Action.

Since Applicant's arguments are not persuasive to overcome the 103(a) obviousness rejections for which these rejections are relied upon and no new arguments have been presented these claims stand rejected as set forth above.

5. Claims 5-7, 25-27, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zafiroglu, US 5,468,320 in view of Hall, Jr., et al., US 3,370,106 as applied to claims 1, 21, and 48 above as set forth in section 5 of the last Office Action.

Since Applicant's arguments are not persuasive to overcome the 103(a) obviousness rejections for which these rejections are relied upon and no new arguments have been presented these claims stand rejected as set forth above.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynda M Salvatore whose telephone number is 703-305-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

October 15, 2003  
ls

  
CHERYL A. JUSKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER